



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/679,058	12/06/84	ISHIYAMA	K 39-1517-2

DECON, FISHER, SPIVAK,  
MCCLELLAND & MAIER  
1755 S. JEFF. DAVIS HWY.  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
BUDD, M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
21.2	9

DATE MAILED: 05/13/86

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined  Responsive to communication filed on 3-17-86  This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), \_\_\_\_\_ days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1.  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2.  Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.  
3.  Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 4.  Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152  
5.  Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1.  Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims 7 15 are withdrawn from consideration.

2.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.

3.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.

4.  Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 are rejected.

5.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.

6.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7.  This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.

8.  Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9.  The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. These drawings are  acceptable;  
 not acceptable (see explanation).

10.  The  proposed drawing correction and/or the  proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
has (have) been  approved by the examiner.  disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11.  The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been  approved.  disapproved (see explanation). However,  
the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are  
corrected. Corrections **MUST** be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO  
EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.

12.  Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has  been received.  not been received

been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in  
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14.  Other

Art Unit 212

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1,2,5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Erickson or Ziedonis in view of Brisken (949) combined with Yoshikawa or Plessset. Erickson and ziedonis teach a flexible transducer assembly that is concave. Brisken teaches that better element isolation is obtained if the piezo elements and the impedance matching layers are completely separated from each other. They can be provided by cutting a large element into smaller elements. Of course, the method of providing the separate element is not relevant to the final structure per se'. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Erickson and ziedonis could be provided with the standard impedance matching elements and damping backing that are conventional in the art. As suggested by Brisken, the impedance matching layers should be separated separate piezo element. Plessset and Yoshikawa

Art Unit 212

teach it may be advantageous to provide a convex transducer. Given that a convex shape would be desired, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to construct Erikson or Ziedonis in this "inside-out" configuration.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Erickson or Ziedonis in view of Brisken combined with Yoshikawa or Plessset as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Larson or Miller.

This claim adds the use of a flexible printed circuit board for electrically connecting the transducer leads. Larson and Miller teach the combination of a flexible transducer is well known and a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a flexible board would be advantageous when dealing with curved structure.

In view of the new rejections, applicants argument are moot.

Further cited to show separated impedance matching layers are Smith and Brisken (684).

Budd/tm

703/557-4862

05/02/86

  
MARK O. BUDD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 212